



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

8

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,142	09/24/2003	George R. Greene JR.	612-04-CIP3-CON	7335

22145 7590 09/01/2006

KLEIN, O'NEILL & SINGH, LLP  
43 CORPORATE PARK  
SUITE 204  
IRVINE, CA 92606

EXAMINER
----------

SWIGER III, JAMES L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3733

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/670,142	Applicant(s) GREENE ET AL.	
	Examiner James L. Swiger	Art Unit 3733	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2006.  
 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-66 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) 29,30,36-55 and 62-66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27,28,31-35 and 56-61 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/24/2003 ; 3/4/2004 ; 5/26/2006</u>                                      | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Applicant's election without traverse of Invention I (claims 27-35, and 56-66) in the reply filed on 8/4/2006 is acknowledged.

Claims 29-30, 36-55, and 62-66 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention/species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 8/4/2006.

### *Double Patenting*

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 27 and 56 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-15 and 17-19 of U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 3733

6,602,261. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each claims a flexible, filamentous carrier with an elastic memory, have a 3-D shape, and an embolizing element that may be stretch resistant.

Further, the difference between the application claims and the patent claims lies in the fact that the patent claims include more elements and are thus much specific. Thus the invention of the patent claims are in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of the application claims. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since the application claims are anticipated by the patent claims, they are not patentably distinct from the patent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 27-28 and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zollikofer et al. ("A Combination of Stainless Steel Coil...").

Zollikofer et al. disclose an embolic device comprising a flexible filamentous carrier along a length of wire (see Fig. 4a). Because of its coiled shape, the wire is capable of elastic memory, being initially configured in a formed loop structure and is

Art Unit: 3733

expandible as a continuous length of microcoil that would form a 3-D shape. Zollikofer et al. also disclose embolizing elements that are formed of an expansible hydrophilic polymer.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zollikofer et al. in view of Phelps et al. (US Patent 5,382,259). Zollikofer et al. disclose the claimed invention *supra* except for the embolizing element to be partially made of stretch-resistant material. Phelps et al. disclose an embolization device comprising a flexible filamentous carrier having a continuous coaxial embolizing element non-releasibly fixed to the exterior surface along a substantial portion of the carrier. The embolizing elements are formed of a stretch-resistant biocompatible polymer (e.g. a polyester or nylon). See Col. 2, lines 50-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Zollikofer et al. having at least a material that is stretch-resistant in view of Phelps et al. to better use the device.

Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zollikofer et al. in view of Palermo et al. (US Patent 5,350,397). Zollikofer discloses the claimed invention except for a linkage element. Palermo et al. teaches to provide a

Art Unit: 3733

proximal end of a carrier with a linkage element that releasably attaches to the carrier, such as to a distal end of a deployment instrument (see Col. 1, lines 6-14). This is done so that the positioning of the coil at the site may be controlled to a fine degree of accuracy (see Col. 2, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Zollikofer et al. with a linkage element in view of Palermo et al. to better control to a fine degree of accuracy the position of the device in use.

Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Zollikofer et al. and Palermo et al. '397 as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Rosenbluth et al. (US Patent 6,015,424).

The combination of Zollikofer et al. and Palermo et al. '397 disclose the claimed invention except for deployment of the linkage element by electric, heat or fluid pressure. Rosenbluth et al. teaches the use of electric current (see Col. 8, lines 10-20), heat (see Col. 2, lines 35-47), and pressure (Col 4, lines 30-37). These variations allow for an improved deployment of the linkage element and embolic device. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of the combination of Zollikofer et al. and Palermo et al. '397 having at least the use of electricity, heat, and or fluid pressure to better deploy the instrument in use.

Claims 59 and 61 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zollikofer et al. in view of Evans et al. (US patent 5,695,480). Zollikofer et al.

Art Unit: 3733

disclose the claimed invention except for the embolizing element being radiopaque.

Evans et al. disclose that the embolizing elements can have radiopaque agents in order that the physician can visualize the delivery of the embolizing elements to the vascular site via convention techniques, such as fluoroscopy (see Col2, lines 15-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Zollikofer et al. with the embolizing elements having radiopaque agents in view of Evans et al. in order to allow the physician to visualize the delivery of the embolizing elements.

Claim 60 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zollikofer et al. Zollikofer et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the embolizing element made of a material selected from a group consisting of polyvinyl alcohol and pHEMA. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the embolizing element out of this material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James L. Swiger whose telephone number is 571-272-

Art Unit: 3733


5557. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on 571-272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

 8/2/06

JLS

  
EDUARDO C. ROBERT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER